

REMARKS

The Office Action dated November 7, 2006 has been reviewed, and the comments of the U.S. Patent Office have been considered. Claims 1, 9 and 10 have been amended. Claims 7, and 13-15 are canceled. Newly added claims 16-23 are presented for the Examiner's review for consideration.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 9, and 10 were objected to for informalities which are corrected by amendment.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 102

Claim 1 stands rejected as anticipated by Dennehey (5462416). The Office Action states that cabinet 228 and tray 26 may be identified with the claim recitation "first and second opposing portion to form a gap therebetween," but with this mapping of elements there is no gap defined as required in the claim. Further down in the Office Action, holding stations 236 are identified with the "first opposing portion" in the claim, so it will be assumed that the rejection was based on a gap defined between holding stations 236 and organizer tray 26 in the reference. The Office Action goes on to identify the claim element "cartridge" with bottom panel 140. However the reference is no consistent with the claim recitation: "said cartridge panel is inserted in said gap." In addition, because the bottom panel 140 is part of the organizer tray 26, it is not clear how a gap can be defined at all. Also, with this mapping, it is not clear how opposing portions 118, 26 (or 236) can be movable with respect to each other to close around bottom panel 140 as stated in the office action.

Applicants propose that Dennehey is distinguishable from claim 1 at least in that it does not show first and second opposing portions spaced apart to form a gap ... [a] cartridge panel is inserted in said gap." In addition, there is nothing in Dennehey corresponding to the above in which the "first and second opposing portions [are] movable with respect to each other to close around said cartridge thereby to cause said at least one actuator to engage said at least one portion and said at least one sensor to engage said at least another portion."

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants propose the rejection under section 102 is in error.

Allowed Claims

Claim 23, newly added, contains the subject matter of allowed claim 3.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this Application and the prompt allowance of claims 1-6, 8-12, and 16-23

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution of the application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-3840. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,



Mark A. Catan
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 38,720

Date: April 5, 2007
Patent Administrator
Proskauer Rose LLP
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20004
Telephone: 202.416.6800
Facsimile: 202.416.6899
CUSTOMER NO: 61263

Customer No. 61263